

REMARKS

This Application has been carefully reviewed in light of the Office Action mailed June 23, 2004. Claims 1-20 were pending in the Application. The Examiner withdraws Claims 19 and 20 as being drawn to a non-elected invention and rejects Claims 1-18. Applicants respectfully request reconsideration and favorable action in this case.

Election Restriction

As requested by the Examiner, Applicants affirm the election to prosecute Claims 1-18 in this Application. Applicants reserve the right to prosecute Claims 19 and 20 in continuation or other applications.

Claim Rejections - 35 U.S.C. § 102

The Examiner rejects Claims 1-17 under 35 U.S.C. § 102(e) as being anticipated by U.S. Patent No. 6,571,275, which issued to Dong, et al. ("*Dong*"). To anticipate a claim, a single prior art reference must describe, either expressly or inherently, each and every element of the claim. M.P.E.P. § 2131.

Applicants' Claim 1 recites:

A method for processing a network management message comprising:
 receiving a network management message;
 parsing the network management message into a plurality of fields; and
 for each of a plurality of client consoles each having filtering criteria, if the fields satisfy the filtering criteria, communicating the fields to the client console for display by the client console.

Applicants respectfully submit that *Dong* fails to describe every element of this claim. In general, *Dong* discloses processing of e-mails. More specifically, *Dong* discloses selectively sorting and displaying e-mail messages to a user of an e-mail system. *See Dong*, at col. 1, line 30–col. 2, line 41; col. 5, lines 33-45.

Among other aspects of Claim 1, *Dong* fails to describe "for each of a plurality of client consoles each having filtering criteria, if the fields satisfy the filtering criteria, communicating the fields to the client console for display by the client console." As teaching

this element, the Examiner cites to *Dong*'s discussion of selectively sorting and displaying e-mail messages to a user of an e-mail system. *See Dong*, at col. 7, line 4–col. 8, line 9. However, Applicants respectfully submit that selectively sorting and displaying e-mail messages to a user of an e-mail system fails to describe “for each of a plurality of client consoles each having filtering criteria, if the fields satisfy the filtering criteria, communicating the fields to the client console for display by the client console.”

For at least these reasons, Applicants respectfully submit that *Dong* fails to describe, either expressly or inherently, each and every element of independent Claim 1. For analogous reasons, Applicants respectfully submit that *Dong* fails to describe, either expressly or inherently, each and every element of independent Claims 9 and 14. Thus, for at least these reasons, Applicants respectfully request the Examiner to reconsider and withdraw the rejection of independent Claims 1, 9, and 14 as well as their respective dependent claims.

In addition, various dependent claims present additional elements not described by *Dong*. Consider dependent Claims 5, 11, and 15. For example, Claim 5 recites:

The method of Claim 1, wherein the filtering criteria comprise a message type and a user type, and the fields satisfy the filtering criteria if a value for a selected one of the fields matches the message type and the user type indicates an authorization to receive the message.

As teaching the elements of Claim 5, the Examiner cites generally to Figure 7, which is a flowchart showing a process for handling input to a message processing unit. *Dong*, at col. 8, lines 10-60. However, Applicants respectfully submit that Figure 7 in no way describes each and every element of Claim 5. In particular, Figure 7 in no way describes “wherein the filtering criteria comprise . . . a user type . . . and the user type indicates an authorization to receive the message.”

For at least these reasons, Applicants respectfully submit that *Dong* fails to describe, either expressly or inherently, each and every element of dependent Claim 5. For analogous reasons, Applicants respectfully submit that *Dong* fails to describe, either expressly or inherently, each and every element of dependent Claims 11 and 15. Thus, for at least these reasons, Applicants respectfully request the Examiner to reconsider and withdraw the rejection of dependent Claims 5, 11, and 15.

Claim Rejections - 35 U.S.C. § 103

The Examiner rejects Claim 18 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over U.S. Patent No. 6,449,643, which issued to Hyndman, et al. ("*Hyndman*"), in view of U.S. Patent No. 6,487,590, which issued to Foley, et al. ("*Foley*"). To establish obviousness of a claimed invention, all claim limitations must be taught or suggested by the prior art. M.P.E.P. § 2143.03.

Applicants' Claim 18 recites:

A communication system comprising:
a client operable to generate a common object request broker architecture (CORBA) command targeted at a network element and to communicate the CORBA command to a server;
the server operable to receive the CORBA command, to determine fields for a transaction language 1 (TL1) command based on the CORBA command, to generate the TL1 command using the fields, to communicate the TL1 command to the network element, and, for each of a plurality of client consoles each having filtering criteria, if the fields satisfy the filtering criteria, to communicate the fields to the client console for display by the client console.

Applicants respectfully submit that *Hyndman* in view of *Foley* fails to teach or suggest every element of this claim. In general, *Hyndman* discloses a technique for controlling access to communication network resources. More specifically, *Hyndman* discloses assigning privileges to network resources when the network resources are discovered. See *Hyndman*, at col. 2, lines 26-42. In general, *Foley* discloses remotely controlling network elements. More specifically, *Foley* discloses monitoring network elements by polling the network elements for tracked attributes. See *Foley*, at col. 1, lines 38-52.

Among other aspects of Claim 18, *Hyndman* in view of *Foley* fails to teach or suggest:

the server operable . . . to determine fields for a transaction language 1 (TL1) command based on the CORBA command, to generate the TL1 command using the fields, to communicate the TL1 command to the network element, and, for each of a plurality of client consoles each having filtering criteria, if the fields satisfy the filtering criteria, to communicate the fields to the client console for display by the client console.

As teaching these elements of Claim 18, the Examiner cites generally to Figures 1 and 5 of *Hyndman*. Specifically, as teaching “to determine fields for a transaction language 1 (TL1) command based on the CORBA command, to generate the TL1 command using the fields, [and] to communicate the TL1 command to the network element,” the Examiner cites to Figure 1, which shows a block diagram of an integrated network manager. *Hyndman*, at col. 4, lines 7-8. Although Figure 1 includes the text “CORBA” and “TL1,” Applicants respectfully submit that neither Figure 1 nor the discussion of Figure 1 teaches or suggests the recited claim elements. *See Hyndman*, at col. 4, line 46–col. 6, line 7.

Also, as teaching “for each of a plurality of client consoles each having filtering criteria, if the fields satisfy the filtering criteria, to communicate the fields to the client console for display by the client console,” the Examiner cites to Figure 5, which presumably refers both to Figure 5A and 5B. Figure 5A is a flowchart showing how access control components respond to a query to determine access privileges. *Hyndman*, at col. 4, lines 18-19. *Hyndman* describes the process:

Whenever BB client 3B requests information on its privileges, arrow G1, the query is forwarded by the read interface 55, arrow 1, to DB access component 54. DB access component 54 accesses DB 57 and returns the privileges information to BB 3B over read interface 55, shown by arrows 2 and G2.

Id., at col. 11, lines 27-37. Applicants respectfully submit that this fails to teach or suggest the recited claim elements. Similarly, Figure 5B is a flowchart showing how a core component interacts with access control components to enforce access privileges. *Id.*, at col. 4, lines 20-22. Whenever a client requests access to a resource, *Hyndman* discloses retrieving privilege information from a database and then communicating the privilege information to the client. *Hyndman*, at col. 11, lines 38-59. Applicants respectfully submit that this also fails to teach or suggest the recited claim elements.

Furthermore, *Foley* fails to teach or suggest the elements of Claim 18 not taught or suggested by *Hyndman*. Thus, for at least these reasons, Applicants respectfully request the Examiner to reconsider and withdraw the rejection of Claim 18.

Conclusion

Applicants have made an earnest attempt to place this case in condition for allowance. For the foregoing reasons, and for other reasons clearly apparent, Applicants respectfully request full allowance of all pending claims. If the Examiner feels that a telephone conference or an interview would advance prosecution of this Application in any manner, the undersigned attorney for Applicants stands ready to conduct such a conference at the convenience of the Examiner.

The Commissioner is hereby authorized to charge any other fees or credit any overpayment to Deposit Account No. 02-0384 of Baker Botts L.L.P.

Respectfully submitted,
BAKER BOTTS L.L.P.
Attorneys for Applicants



Kurt M. Pankratz
Reg. No. 46,977

Date: Sep 23, 2004

Baker Botts L.L.P.
2001 Ross Avenue
Dallas, Texas 75201-2980
Tel. 214.953.6584

Customer Number: **05073**